

54



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 09/733,942 | 12/11/2000 | Terue Watanabe | JP919990219US1 | 5167 |
| 7590 03/17/2005 James B. Murray 69 South Gate Drive Poughkeepsie, NY 12601 | | | EXAMINER YANG, RYAN R | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2672 | |
| DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/733,942 | Applicant(s) WATANABE, TERUE | |
| | Examiner Ryan R Yang | Art Unit 2672 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7,9-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17,19-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/22/2004 has been entered.

DETAILED ACTION

2. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/22/2004. This action is non-final.
3. Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5 and 9 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 12/22/2004, claims 1, 6, 10, 13-17 and 20 were amended.
4. This application claims foreign priority dated 12/28/99.
5. The present title of the invention is "Method of displaying magnified and reduced areas and apparatus thereof" as filed originally.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1, 6, 10, 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains

subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The added limitation in claim 1 - "a certain portion of at least one displayed line of a diagram is magnified or reduced **leaving unchanged portion of the at least one line**", and subsequent limitation relating to "line" in claims 1, 6 and 10 are not disclosed in specification.

8. Claims 13-14 are rejected based on the rejected claim 1.

9. Claim 16 is rejected based on the rejected claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 5, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Gould (6,219,052) and further in view of Ramage (4,790,028).

11. As per claim 5, Gould discloses an apparatus for displaying magnified or reduced area, comprising:

means for storing diagram linkage information as to how size and pattern density of other portions of a diagram are affected when a certain portion of a diagram is magnified or reduced (Figure 11 60 relative controller box which triggers the relative control function);

means for magnifying or reducing the certain portion of the diagram with a designated magnification or reduction ratio (Figure 11 60 "When the relative controller box 60 is clicked on and dragged rightward ... that the non-salient (non-highlighted) parts of the original screen 57 have been shrunk or condensed", column 6, line 6-10);

means for magnifying or reducing the other portions of the diagram other than the magnified or reduced portion of the diagram in accordance with the diagram linkage information (Figure 3 52 where the subsequently linked pages has more reduced images);

means for obtaining the display specification information corresponding to the magnification or reduction ratio of each of the portions of the diagrams (Figure 11 60 “When the relative controller box 60 is clicked on and dragged rightward ... that the non-salient (non-highlighted) parts of the original screen 57 have been shrunk or condensed”, column 6, line 6-10); and

means for displaying each portion of the diagram based on the display specification information characterizing to each portion magnification or reduction ratio so that the pattern densities of the different portions of the diagram are characterized differently from each other and from unchanged portions of the diagram depending on their magnification or reduction in the display (Figure 11 70 where the scroll bar has marked segment represents “the scope of the salient segments and thus the modified text representation”, column 6, line 23-24; as for the pattern density, since the pattern density changes with the magnification or reduction ration, it is inherent the indicator also indicate the changes in density).

Gould discloses a method of displaying magnified or reduced areas of a diagram. It is noted that Gould does not explicitly disclose representing unchanged portions of the diagram, however, this is known in the part as taught by Ramage. Ramage

discloses a method of representing magnified region with corresponding reduced region and an unchanged region (Figure 3).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ramage into Gould because Gould discloses a method of displaying magnified or reduced areas of a diagram and Ramage discloses an unchanged region can also be displayed in order for easy comparison with the changed portions.

Regarding the "means plus function" language, the means refer to the software methods executed on generically disclosed hardware explicitly disclosed by Gould. It is further noted that both software and hardware means are functionally equivalent.

12. As per claim 9, Gould discloses a computer program on a computer-readable recording medium for displaying a single page diagram having magnified and reduced areas, wherein the program comprises:

software for diagram linkage information indicating how other portions of a diagram are to be reduced to maintain display of the full diagram when a certain portion of the diagram is magnified (Figure 11 60 relative controller box which triggers the relative control function);

software responsive to the diagram and image information for magnifying the certain portion of the diagram with a designated magnification ratio (Figure 11 60 "When the relative controller box 60 is clicked on and dragged rightward ... that the non-salient (non-highlighted) parts of the original screen 57 have been shrunk or condensed", column 6, line 6-10);

software for reducing the portions of the diagram other than the magnified or reduced portion of the diagram in accordance with the diagram linkage information to compensate for the increase in the certain portion (Figure 11 60 "When the relative controller box 60 is clicked on and dragged rightward ... that the non-salient (non-highlighted) parts of the original screen 57 have been shrunk or condensed", column 6, line 6-10);

software for obtaining the display specification information characterizing the magnification or reduction ratio of each of the portions of the diagram (Figure 11 58);

software for displaying each of the portions of the diagram in accordance with the display specification information characterizing each magnification or reduction ratio so that the magnified and reduced portions of the diagram are characterized differently from each other and unchanged portions of the diagram depending on their magnification or reduction ratio in the display (Figure 11 70 where the scroll bar has marked segment represents "the scope of the salient segments and thus the modified text representation", column 6, line 23-24).

Gould discloses a method of displaying magnified or reduced areas of a diagram. It is noted that Gould does not explicitly disclose representing unchanged portions of the diagram, however, this is known in the art as taught by Ramage. Ramage discloses a method of representing magnified region with corresponding reduced region and an unchanged region (Figure 3).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ramage into Gould because Gould

Art Unit: 2672

discloses a method of displaying magnified or reduced areas of a diagram and Ramage discloses an unchanged region can also be displayed in order for easy comparison with the changed portions.

13. As per claim 12, Gould and Ramage demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, *supra*, and Gould further discloses software for changing the pattern density of a portion of the diagram characterized to its magnification or reduction in the diagram (since the pattern density changes with the magnification or reduction ratio, it is inherent the indicator also indicates the changes in density).

14. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould (6,219,052) and Ramage as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Sakuma et al. (5,323,173).

15. As per claim 7, Gould and Ramage demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 5, *supra*.

Gould and Ramage disclose an apparatus of displaying images with varying resolutions. It is noted that Gould and Ramage do not explicitly disclose "a shade of color of a portion of the diagram is changed in correspondence to the magnification or reduction ratio", however, this is known in the art as taught by Sakuma et al., hereinafter Sakuma. Sakuma discloses a method of displaying image in which color is changed in accordance with changing scale factor (column 10, line 46-47).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sakuma into Gould and Ramage

Art Unit: 2672

because Gould and Ramage disclose an apparatus of displaying images with varying resolution and Sakuma discloses the color of the image of changed resolution can be changed accordingly in order to easily discern the changes in image.

16. As per claim 11, Gould and Ramage demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, *supra*.

Gould and Ramage disclose a computer program for displaying images with varying resolutions. It is noted that Gould does not explicitly disclose "a shade of color of a portion of the diagram is changed in correspondence to the magnification or reduction ratio", however, this is known in the art as taught by Sakuma et al., hereinafter Sakuma. Sakuma discloses a method of displaying image in which color is changed in accordance with changing scale factor (column 10, line 46-47).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sakuma into Gould and Ramage because Gould and Ramage disclose a software program for displaying images with varying resolution and Sakuma discloses the color of the image of changed resolution can be changed accordingly in order to easily discern the changes in image.

17. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould (6,219,052) and Ramage, and further in view of Smith (5,737,507).

18. As per claims 15 and 18, Gould and Ramage demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claims 5 and 9, *supra*, respectively.

Gould and Ramage disclose a method of displaying images with varying resolutions. It is noted that Gould and Ramage do not explicitly disclose linking the

Art Unit: 2672

displaying of the diagram to a pointing device so that a display area is magnified when the area is pointed to by the pointing device, however, this is known in the art as taught by Smith. Smith discloses a display area resizing method in which "The user initiates resizing of window 102 by actuating button 210B on pointing device 210 while cursor 126 is positioned at point 304A and moving pointing device 210 while maintaining pointing device 210 in an actuated state" (column 7, line 37-41).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Smith and Ramage into Gould because Gould and Ramage disclose a method of displaying images with varying resolutions and Smith discloses the intended area can be scaled by a pointing device in order to easily manipulate the scaling.

Allowable Subject Matter

19. Claims 17, 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As per claims 17 and 20, the closest prior art by Gould, Ramage, Smith or Kojima do not explicitly disclose the limitation "said diagram is lines of alphanumeric characters and said certain portion is a rectangular magnified area of the characters including some but not all lines of said characters and said reduced portions are characters in rectangular areas surrounding said magnified area that includes some but

Art Unit: 2672

not all characters surrounding said magnified area that includes some but not all characters surrounding the rectangular magnified area where the characters in both the magnified and reduced areas retain their character state and properties”.

As per claim 19, the closest prior art by Gould or Ramage do not explicitly disclose the limitation “providing a numeric indication as to the number of bits in each portion along with a bar diagram in said scale”.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 5 and 9, applicant alleges Ramage only disclose unchanged and expanded portions of diagram. In reply, examiner considers Figure 3 shows all unchanged, reduced and expanded portions.

Conclusion


21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquiries

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan R Yang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6133 ((571) 272-7666 after 3/21/2005). The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713 ((571) 272-7664 after 3/21/2005). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Ryan Yang
March 14, 2005